

How to read and present your IT and ServiceNow Value Scorecard

ValueNow Value Leakage Calculator · October 2026 edition

Your scorecard follows the ValueNow value chain: **Finding** → **Technical debt** → **Value leakage** → **KPI** → **Realized value**. Every number comes from your answers plus a few planning assumptions you can change. The examples below use the sample company **Sample Co.** (the same numbers as “See it with sample numbers”).

How and why to use this report

Less effort, more value. Critical IT processes are often immature and informally managed, which makes consistent execution difficult just as scrutiny is rising. Workshops and consulting usually spend days gathering and analyzing data built for one-time use before any advice arrives. This report starts from what your team already knows about your IT operations, so the analysis is ready the moment you finish answering. The scorecard, executive deck and executive report are ready made: review and modify them rather than build them. Spend less time gathering information and more time analyzing and making evidence-based decisions.

Why it helps. Most ServiceNow problems are described in technical terms (customizations, reassignments, CMDB gaps) that leaders can't weigh against other priorities. This report translates them into the language decisions are made in: what each problem costs a year, what to fix first, how long it takes to see results, and how you will prove the improvement. Because every number shows its calculation and assumptions, people can check it instead of debating it.

EXAMPLE: THE ONE-LINE MESSAGE THIS REPORT GIVES YOU

“An estimated **\$1.3M** a year is leaking from our ServiceNow investment; about **\$1.1M** of it is reachable with quick wins we can start in the next 60 days.”

Who to share it with, and why each audience needs something different:

Peers: platform team, process owners, service desk leads

Goal: agree the facts before anyone else sees them. **Show:** the “Where value is leaking” table and the planning assumptions (deck slides 5 and 8). **Ask them:** are the numbers right, who owns each finding, and which quick wins can start this month? **Why first:** findings your colleagues have checked and own are far harder for anyone to dismiss later, and the people who do the work feel part of the fix rather than blamed for the problem.

Your manager

Goal: get support and priority. **Show:** the value health score, the quick wins and the KPIs (deck slides 3, 6 and 7). **Ask for:** agreement on the first 30–60-day actions, the time or people needed, and a monthly KPI check-in. **Why:** a manager can say yes to a short, owned, measurable plan with visible early returns much more easily than to a list of problems.

Executives and sponsors (CIO, CFO, business leaders)

Goal: a decision. **Show:** the headline and the size of the leakage first (deck slides 2 and 4), then the plan (slide 6). Keep it to three points: what it costs today, what can be recovered quickly, and what you need from them. **Ask for:** one clear decision: approve the quick-win plan, fund the larger fixes, or sponsor a full maturity assessment to confirm the numbers. **Why:** executives compare options in dollars and risk. A forecast with its assumptions in plain view earns more trust than a confident number nobody can check.

Suggested steps:

1. Check your answers and adjust the planning assumptions so the numbers reflect your organization.
2. Walk peers through the findings table; correct anything they can prove and name an owner for each item.
3. Brief your manager on the quick wins and the KPIs you will report monthly.
4. Present the executive deck: headline first, three points, one decision requested.
5. Re-run the value case each month or quarter and compare KPIs with today's baseline, so the next conversation is about realized value, not forecasts.

Present the numbers as estimates ("forecast, not invoice") and point to the calculation behind each one. That honesty is what makes the case credible.

Key terms: technical debt and value leakage

Technical debt

The ongoing cost, complexity, risk or constraint created by earlier design, maintenance, process or governance decisions. It includes the everyday working practices that keep that burden in place. A **finding** is what you can see today; technical debt is **why** it keeps happening.

EXAMPLE: TECHNICAL DEBT

Finding: Heavy customization (about 1,800 records), and upgrades are falling behind. Why upgrades are two or more releases behind: "Custom scripts in Incident and HR break on each upgrade, and regression testing is manual, so upgrades keep getting postponed."

Technical debt: Custom code duplicates or blocks out-of-box features and must be retested every upgrade. Every upgrade, that custom work has to be checked and fixed again, so the cost repeats year after year.

Value leakage

The money lost each year because of that technical debt: staff hours spent on avoidable work, licenses paid for but not used, rework after failed changes. It is an **estimate built from your own numbers**, and the calculation is always shown so you can check it. If there isn't enough evidence to put a fair dollar figure on an impact (for example, the cost of user downtime), it stays "nonfinancial" rather than being guessed. Value leakage is a forecast, not an invoice.

EXAMPLE: VALUE LEAKAGE

Customization drag on upgrades: $1,800 \text{ records} \times 1.5 \text{ hrs/yr} \times \$65/\text{hr} = \text{\$175,500 a year.}$

Licenses paid for but not used: $135 \text{ unused} \times \$1,200 \text{ per license per year} = \text{\$162,000 a year.}$

EXAMPLE: ONE FINDING THROUGH THE WHOLE VALUE CHAIN

Finding: 135 of 600 fulfiller licenses (22.5%) show no use in 90 days.

Technical debt: License entitlements are not tied to roles or reviewed against actual use.

Value leakage: \$162,000 a year (135 unused × \$1,200 per license per year)

KPI: License utilization, from 77.5% today to 90% or higher

Realized value: Licenses re-harvested or removed at the next true-up, verified against the contract.

1. Value health score (0–100) and rating

The average of the four area scores below, rounded. An area you didn't answer is left out of the average rather than counted as zero.

Rating: 75–100 = **Strong**, 50–74 = **Developing**, below 50 = **At risk**.

EXAMPLE: VALUE HEALTH SCORE

$(30 + 46 + 55 + 25) \div 4 = 39 \rightarrow$ **At risk**

2. Estimated annual value leakage

The yearly cost of the problems we can put a dollar figure on, added together. “Priced” findings have enough of your numbers to estimate; “not yet priced” findings are real issues that need a measurement first (for example, the cost of user downtime). They are never guessed.

EXAMPLE: ESTIMATED ANNUAL VALUE LEAKAGE

- Tickets bounce between groups: **\$514,800**
- Low self-service resolution: **\$351,000**
- Customization drag on upgrades: **\$175,500**
- Licenses paid for but not used: **\$162,000**
- Failed and backed-out changes: **\$84,240**

Total = **\$1,287,540** (shown as \$1.3M) · 5 priced · 6 not yet priced

3. Reachable in 60 days

The part of the leakage tied to **quick wins**: findings rated Low or Medium effort that can start within 30 or 60 days. It shows how much value is within reach without a major program.

EXAMPLE: REACHABLE IN 60 DAYS

Tickets bounce between groups \$514,800 + Licenses paid for but not used \$162,000 + Low self-service resolution \$351,000 + Failed and backed-out changes \$84,240 = **\$1,112,040** (shown as \$1.1M)

4. Scores by area

Each bar is 0–100: green is 75 or more, light green 50–74, orange below 50. Each area is the average of its parts:

Platform health

Customization: light 100, moderate 60, heavy 25, unknown 40. Upgrades: latest release 100, one behind 75, two or more behind 35.

EXAMPLE: PLATFORM HEALTH

- Customization level: **25**
- Upgrade currency: **35**

Average = **30**

Service operations

Self-service: your share ÷ the 40% planning target × 100. Reassignment: $100 - 3 \times (\text{your rate} - 5)$. Resolution time: target hours ÷ actual hours × 100. Fulfillment: $100 - 12 \times (\text{days} - 2)$. Each part is kept between 0 and 100; unanswered parts are skipped.

EXAMPLE: SERVICE OPERATIONS

- Self-service vs target: **30**
- Reassignment: **49**
- Resolution time vs target: **53**
- Request fulfillment time: **52**

Average = **46**

License value

(Licenses used ÷ licenses paid for) as a percentage, then $(\text{utilization} - 50) \times 2$. 100% use scores 100; 50% or less scores 0.

EXAMPLE: LICENSE VALUE

$465 \div 600 = 77.5\% \rightarrow (77.5 - 50) \times 2 = \mathbf{55}$

Governance & measurement

Your four governance answers: Yes 100, Partly 50, No 0.

EXAMPLE: GOVERNANCE & MEASUREMENT

- Platform owner and governance: **50**
- Trusted CMDB: **0**
- Monthly KPI baseline: **50**
- Realized-value tracking: **0**

Average = **25**

5. Quick wins

Up to four Low- or Medium-effort findings, listed by how soon they can start (30 days, then 60) and then by value. Each line shows the start window, the effort, and the yearly value where it can be priced.

EXAMPLE: QUICK WINS

1. **Tickets bounce between groups** · 30 days · Low effort · \$515K/yr
2. **Licenses paid for but not used** · 30 days · Low effort · \$162K/yr
3. **Platform ownership is only partly defined** · 30 days · Low effort
4. **KPI baseline is incomplete** · 30 days · Low effort

6. Where value is leaking (the value chain table)

The six largest findings by value, one per row. Any others are in the executive deck.

Finding

What your answers show is happening today.

Technical debt

The underlying cause: design, process or governance decisions that keep the problem in place.

Value leakage / yr

The yearly cost, with the calculation underneath in small print so you can check it. "Nonfinancial" means it is real but needs a measurement before it can be priced.

KPI (baseline → target)

The measure to track. The baseline is your number today; the target is a starting point to agree with the owner.

Realized value

How you will prove the improvement actually happened after the fix, not just forecast it.

EXAMPLE: THE TOP ROW

Tickets bounce between groups

Finding: 22% of incidents are reassigned more than once.

Technical debt: Assignment rules, categories, and CMDB support groups are out of date.

Value leakage: **\$514,800** = 15,840 reassigned/yr × 0.5 hrs × \$65/hr

KPI: Multi-reassignment rate, 22% → 10% or lower

Realized value: Fewer handoffs and faster resolution for the affected categories.

7. Planning assumptions

A few figures can't come from your answers, so we start with planning values. Open "Planning assumptions" below the scorecard to change them; the scorecard and deck update immediately.

- Self-service planning target: **40 %**
- Max self-service shift modeled in year one: **10 pts**
- Extra effort per reassigned incident: **0.5 hrs**
- Rework effort per failed change: **12 hrs**
- Upkeep effort per customized record: **1.5 hrs/yr**

Value leakage is a forecast, not an invoice. Use the scorecard to decide where to look first, then confirm the numbers with the KPIs.

© 2026 ValueNow, a Sage Choice, LLC company. Estimates are based on stated inputs and assumptions and are not a guarantee of results. ServiceNow is a trademark of ServiceNow, Inc. ValueNow and Sage Choice, LLC are independent and are not affiliated with, endorsed by, or sponsored by ServiceNow, Inc. ITIL® is a registered trademark of the PeopleCert group. All rights reserved. Other product names are the property of their respective owners.